arXiv:1510.06956v1 [math.DS] 23 Oct 2015

ON THE IRREGULAR POINTS FOR SYSTEMS WITH THE SHADOWING PROPERTY

YIWEI DONG, PIOTR OPROCHA, AND XUETING TIAN

Abstract. We prove that when f is a continuous selfmap acting on compact metric space (X, d) which satisfies the shadowing property, then the set of irregular points (i.e. points with divergent Birkhoff averages) has full entropy.

Using this fact we prove that in the class of C^0-generic maps on manifolds, we can only observe (in the sense of Lebesgue measure) points with convergant Birkhoff averages. In particular, the time average of atomic measures along orbit of such points converges to some SRB-like measure in the weak* topology. Moreover, such points carry zero entropy. In contrast, irregular points are non-observable but carry infinite entropy.

1. Introduction

Consider a continuous selfmap f acting on a compact metric space (X, d). For a continuous function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and for every point $x \in X$, we have the Birkhoff average $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^i(x))$. According to the classical Birkhoff ergodic theorem, such average converges for a set of x with full f-invariant measure. We call such points $\varphi-$regular points. In contrast, the complementary set are called $\varphi-$irregular set and the union $I(f) := \bigcup_{\varphi\in C(X,\mathbb{R})} I_\varphi(f)$ is called irregular set.

From the viewpoint of the ergodic theory, the irregular sets $I_\varphi(f)$ and $I(f)$ are too small to be concerned. However, a deep insight reveals that it might be rather large in this or that way. So let us recall some related results.

For symbolic dynamics, Fan *et al* [11] showed that $I_\varphi(f)$ either is empty or has full topological entropy. That is, $I_\varphi(f)$ can be as complex as the whole system. Later on, Barreira and Schmeling [4] studied a broad class of systems including conformal repellers and horseshoes and showed that the irregular set carries full entropy and Hausdoff dimension. Besides that, Olsen [21, 22, 23] introduced and developed a multifractal framework via deformations of empirical measures. Motivated by these results, Chen *et al* [8] considered irregular points for systems with specification property. They used a non-symbolic method inspired by Takens and Verbitskiy [28] and show that $I(f)$ has full topological entropy. Aside from these dimensional description, Li and Wu [19] obtained that for systems with specification property, I_φ is either empty or residual, which gives a topological characterization.

Among the systems concerned above, the specification property is widely fulfilled, including symbolic systems and Axiom A systems [26]. So it is natural to extend results for systems with such property. Thompson made an attempt in this direction. He considered systems with the almost specification property which was naturally weaker than the specification property [25] and proved that [29] $I_\varphi(f)$ either is empty or carries full entropy.

However, we focus on another weaker property in this paper. More precisely, we consider systems with the shadowing property since the specification property

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37C50; 37B40; 37C20.

Key words and phrases. Shadowing, Irregular Points, C^0 Generic, Topological Entropy.

implies topological mixing and the shadowing property [26]. We give topological and measure-theoretic characterizations of $I(f)$.

Before proceeding, we should mention that the almost specification property does not imply the shadowing property. This can be seen from the following example.

Example 1.1. *Consider a homeomorphism $f\colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ such that $0, 1$ are the only fixed points of f. Then it is not hard to check that f has the shadowing property (e.g. see [7]). It is clear that the only invariant measures of f are supported on fixed points $0, 1$ and one of them is an attractor. This immediately implies that $I(f) = \emptyset$ and one easily sees that $\frac{\delta_0+\delta_1}{2} \in \mathcal{M}_f([0,1])$ cannot be approximated by ergodic measures. Thus $([0,1], f)$ does not satisfy the almost specification property since for such systems, the ergodic measures are entropy dense* [24].

So new obstacles come out in such systems compared with Thompson's result, one of which is the lack of transitivity. To solve this problem, we restrict our attention to a single support of some ergodic measure μ which captures enough information of the entropy (by variational principle). Thus it is possible to conduct our procedure using the transitivity of $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. Moreover, to create the irregular points we need, we also require another ergodic measure ν supported on μ. This is another novelty which is discussed at large in § 3 and concluded as corollary 3.4. Furthermore, we give a general illustration of the variational principle beyond the representative set $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ and put it as theorem 4.1. Finally, we use the above theorem to prove our first result which is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *If (X, f) has the shadowing property then exactly one of the following conditions hold:*

(1) $h_{top}(f) > 0$, $I(f) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$h^B_{top}(f, I(f)) = h^P_{top}(f, I(f)) = h^{UC}_{top}(f, I(f)) = h_{top}(f),$$

or

(2) $h_{top}(f) = 0$ and $I(f) = \emptyset$.

Here, the three kinds of topological entropy are defined in § 2.3.

Now that we have figured out the case of the irregular points for systems with the shadowing property, let us recall two recent results which help us march to the C^0 generic setting. One is that for a compact topological manifold M with a decomposition, the C^0-generic continuous map $f : M \to M$ has the shadowing property [17]. The other is that [3] for a compact connected boundaryless smooth manifold M, C^0 generic map (resp. homeomorphism) $f : M \to M$ is weird. That is, Lebesgue *a.e.* $x \in M$ has a well-defined Birkhoff limit μ_x, but f is totally singular and moreover admits no physical measure.

Beyond Abdenur and Andersson's description in [3], we can use our first result and the notion of SRB-like measure introduced in [6] to achieve more goals. We put it in detail as follows (notions concerned are given in § 2.1).

Theorem 1.3. *Let M be a compact topological manifold (with or without boundary) of dimension at least 2 and assume that M admits a decomposition. Then for generic $f \in H(M)$ (the same for generic $f \in C(M)$), we have the following conclusions:*

(1) there is a set $\Lambda \subset M$ such that
  (i) $\mathscr{L}(\Lambda) = 1$;
  (ii) $\Lambda \subset Q(f) \cap \Delta$;
  (iii) $h^B_{top}(f, \Lambda) = h^P_{top}(f, \Lambda) = h^{UC}_{top}(f, \Lambda) = 0$;

(2) $h^B_{top}(f, I(f)) = h^P_{top}(f, I(f)) = h^{UC}_{top}(f, I(f)) = \infty$.

Remark 1.4. It is shown that [6, Theorem 1.5] for any topological dynamical system $f : M \to M$, $\mathcal{O}_f$ is the smallest weak* compact subset of $\mathcal{M}(M)$ such that $\mathscr{L}(\Delta) = 1$. In the present paper, for generic $f \in H(M)$ (resp. $C(M)$), we show further that

$$\mathscr{L}(Q(f) \cap \Delta) = 1.$$

Question 1.5. Can we show further that $h^{UC}_{\text{top}}(\Delta) = 0$?

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Some notions and notations.** A *dynamical system* is a pair (X, f) consisting of a compact metric space (X, d) and a continuous map $f\colon X \to X$. If for every nonempty open sets U, V there is n such that $f^n(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$ then (X, f) is *transitive*. When for every nonempty open sets U, V there exists N such that $f^n(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$ for every $n > N$ then (X, f) is *topologically mixing*. We denote the diameter of any subset $A \subset X$ by

$$\operatorname{diam}(A) = \sup_{x,y\in A}\{d(x, y)\}.$$

2.1.1. *Invariant measures.* We denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the set of Borel probability measures on X. Let $\{\varphi_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a dense subset of $C(X, \mathbb{R})$, then

$$\rho(\xi, \tau) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\int \varphi_j d\xi - \int \varphi_j d\tau|}{2^j \|\varphi_j\|}$$

defines a metric on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ for the *weak** topology [30], where

$$\|\varphi_i\| = \max\{|\varphi_i(x)| : x \in X\}.$$

Note that

$$\rho(\xi, \tau) \leq 2 \text{ for any } \xi, \tau \in \mathcal{M}(X). \tag{2.1}$$

It is also well know that the natural projection $x \mapsto \delta_x$ is continuous and if we define operator T_f on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ by formula $T_f\mu(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A))$, then we can identify (X, f) with T_f restricted to the set of Dirac measures (these systems are conjugate). Therefore, without loss of generality we will assume that $d(x, y) = \rho(\delta_x, \delta_y)$. This combining with (2.1) gives

Lemma 2.1. *Let (X, f) be a dynamical system and let $x \in X$.*

(1) Let $0 \leq k < m < n$ and $x \in X$. Then

$$\rho(\mathcal{E}_m(x), \mathcal{E}_n(f^k(x))) \leq \frac{2}{n}(n - m + k),$$

(2) Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, for every $y \in B_p(x, \varepsilon)$ we have $\rho(\mathcal{E}_p(y), \mathcal{E}_p(x)) < \varepsilon$.
(3) Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $p \leq q \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2)p$, for every $y \in B_p(x, \varepsilon)$ we have $\rho(\mathcal{E}_q(y), \mathcal{E}_p(x)) < 2\varepsilon$.

We say that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ is f-invariant if for any measurable set $E \subset X$, we have

$$\mu(E) = \mu(f^{-1}E).$$

The set of f-invariant measures in $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_f(X)$. A dynamical system (X, f) is *uniquely ergodic* when $\mathcal{M}_f(X)$ is a singleton.

2.1.2. *Manifold with a decomposition and generic property.* Let M be a compact n-dimensional ($n \geq 1$) topological manifold. We say that M admits a *decomposition* if there exist sets $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ such that $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} H_i$, every set H_i is homeomorphic to the n-dimensional unit, closed ball D^n and $\operatorname{int} H_i \cap \operatorname{int} H_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$.

Let M be a compact manifold with a decomposition. We can induce normalized Lebesgue measure $\mathscr{L}$ on M, projecting it from D^n. For every $1 \leq i \leq k$ take homeomorphisms $\xi_i : H_i \to D^n$ and denote by m the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then the sets $A \subset M$ such that $\xi_i(A \cap H_i)$ is a Lebesgue measurable set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are called *Lebesgue measurable on* M. Clearly, it is a well defined σ-algebra. For any (Lebesgue) measurable set $A \subset M$, we define

$$\mathscr{L}(A) := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{m(\xi_i(A \cap H_i)}{m(D^n)}. \tag{2.2}$$

One sees that $\mathscr{L}$ is non-atomic and positive on open sets since each ξ_i is a homeomorphism. Moreover, $\mathscr{L}(M) = 1$. Thus $\mathscr{L}$ is well defined measure on M.

Let $C(M)$ denotes the set of continuous maps on M and $H(M)$ the set of homeomorphisms on M. We endow $C(M)$ with the metric

$$d_C(f, g) = \sup_{x \in M} d(fx, gx)$$

and $H(M)$ with the metric

$$d_H(f, g) = d_C(f, g) + d_C(f^{-1}, g^{-1}).$$

Both spaces $(C(M), d_C)$, $(H(M), d_H)$ are complete.

A subset $\mathcal{R}$ of a metric space X is *residual* if it contains a countable intersection of dense open sets. A property $\mathcal{P}$ is called *generic* in the space X if there is a residual subset $\mathcal{R}$ of X such that any $f \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}$. One notes that for a complete metric space, a countable intersection of dense open sets is also dense.

2.1.3. *SRB-like measure.* Define the n-th empirical measure of $x \in X$ as

$$\mathcal{E}_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^j(x)},$$

where δ_y is the Dirac measure at $y \in X$. For points of x such that $\mathcal{E}_n(x)$ converges, one sees that $\mathcal{E}_n(x)$ converges to some invariant probability measure and such points are named *quasi-regular points* (see [9] or [30]), which we denote by $Q(f)$.

Let $pw(x)$ denote the limit set of $\mathcal{E}_n(x)$ in $\mathcal{M}(X)$. A probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(M)$ is *SRB-like* (or *observable* or *pseudo-physical*) if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the set

$$A_\varepsilon(\mu) = \{x \in M \colon \rho(p\omega(x), \mu) < \varepsilon\}$$

has positive Lebesgue measure. The set $A_\varepsilon(\mu)$ is called basin of $\varepsilon-$attraction of μ.

Let $\mathcal{O}_f$ denote the set of all SRB-like measures for f. Define

$$\Delta = \{x : pw(x) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_f\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Δ is the maximal set such that all limit points of empirical measure of points in this set are SRB-like.

2.2. **(almost) specification and shadowing.**

2.2.1. *Specification.* We say (X, f) satisfies the *specification* property if for all $\epsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$, there exists an integer $m(\epsilon)$ such that for any collection $\{I_j = [a_j, b_j] \subset \mathbb{N} : j = 1, \cdots, k\}$ of finite intervals with $a_{j+1} - b_j \geq m(\epsilon)$ for $j = 1, \cdots, k-1$ and any $x_1, \cdots, x_k$ in X, there exists a point $x \in X$ such that

$$d(f^{a_j+t}x, f^t x_j) < \epsilon$$

for all $t = 0, \cdots, b_j - a_j$ and $j = 1, \cdots, k$. Furthermore, we say f satisfies Bowen's periodic specification property if the point x can be chosen to be periodic with period p for every $p \geq b_k - a_1 + m(\epsilon)$.

2.2.2. *Almost Specification.* Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. A function $g : \mathbb{N} \times (0, \varepsilon_0) \to \mathbb{N}$ is called a *mistake function* if for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $g(n, \varepsilon) \leq g(n+1, \varepsilon)$ and

$$\lim_n \frac{g(n, \varepsilon)}{n} = 0.$$

If $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_0$, we define $g(n, \varepsilon) = g(n, \varepsilon_0)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough such that $g(n, \varepsilon) < n$, we define

$$I(g; n, \varepsilon) := \{\Lambda \subset \{0, 1, \cdots, n-1\} : |\Lambda| \geq n - g(n, \varepsilon)\},$$

where $|\Lambda|$ denotes the cardinality of Λ. For a finite set of indices $\Lambda \subset \{0, 1, \cdots, n-1\}$, we define the *Bowen distance* of $x, y \in X$ along Λ by

$$d_\Lambda(x, y) := \max_{j \in \Lambda} \{d(f^j x, f^j y)\}$$

and the *Bowen ball* of radius ε centered at x by

$$B_\Lambda(x, \varepsilon) := \{y \in X : d_\Lambda(x, y) < \varepsilon\}.$$

Especially, when $\Lambda = \{0, 1, \cdots, n-1\}$, we denote $d_\Lambda(x, y)$ by $d_n(x, y)$ and $B_\Lambda(x, \varepsilon)$ by $B_n(x, \varepsilon)$. When $g(n, \varepsilon) < n$, we define the $(g; n, \varepsilon)$-Bowen ball centered at x as

$$B_n(g; x, \varepsilon) := \{y \in X : y \in B_\Lambda(x, \varepsilon) \text{ for some } \Lambda \in I(g; n, \varepsilon)\} = \bigcup_{\Lambda \in I(g;n,\varepsilon)} B_\Lambda(x, \varepsilon).$$

The dynamical system (X, f) has *almost specification* property with mistake function g, if there exists a function $k_g : (0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0, \cdots, \varepsilon_m > 0$, any points $x_1, \cdots, x_m \in X$, and any integers $n_1 \geq k_g(\varepsilon_1), \cdots, n_m \geq k_g(\varepsilon_m)$, we can find a point $z \in X$ such that

$$f^{l_j}(z) \in B_{n_j}(g; x_j, \varepsilon_j),\ j = 1, \cdots, m,$$

where $n_0 = 0$ and $l_j = \sum_{s=0}^{j-1} n_s$.

In other words, the appropriate part of the orbit of z ε_j-traces the orbit of x_j with at most $g(n_j, \varepsilon_j)$ mistakes.

2.2.3. *Shadowing.* A sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X$ is called a *δ-pseudo-orbit* of f if

$$d(f(x_n), x_{n+1}) < \delta \text{ for any } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Moreover, a δ-pseudo-orbit $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is *ε-shadowed* by an orbit of $y \in X$ if

$$d(f^n(y), x_n) < \varepsilon \text{ for any } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Wee say that $f \colon X \to X$ has the *shadowing property* if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that any δ-pseudo-orbit is ε-shadowed by some orbit.

2.3. **Topological entropy.** In this part, we recall three versions of topological entropy. Familiar readers will find that they correspond to upper box dimension, Hausdoff dimension and packing dimension in the classical dimension theory. For details, one is referred to [10, 13, 20].

2.3.1. *upper capacity topological entropy.* Let $Z \subset M$. A set S is (n,ε)-separated for Z if $S \subset Z$ and $d_n(x,y) > \varepsilon$ for any $x, y \in S$ and $x \neq y$. A set $S \subset Z$ if (n,ε)-spanning for Z if for any $x \in Z$, there exists $y \in S$ such that $d_n(x,y) \leq \varepsilon$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} s_n(Z,\varepsilon) &= \sup\{|S| : S \text{ is } (n,\varepsilon) - \text{separated for } Z\}, \\ r_n(Z,\varepsilon) &= \inf\{|S| : S \text{ is } (n,\varepsilon) - \text{spanning for } Z\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to see that the following holds

$$r_n(Z,\varepsilon) \leq s_n(Z,\varepsilon) \leq r_n(Z,\varepsilon/2). \tag{2.4}$$

We define *upper capacity topological entropy* of $E \subset X$ by:

$$h^{UC}_{\text{top}}(f,E) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log s_n(E,\varepsilon)}{n} = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log r_n(E,\varepsilon)}{n}. \tag{2.5}$$

2.3.2. *Bowen topological entropy.* Let $E \subset X$, and $\mathcal{G}_n(E,\sigma)$ be the collection of all finite or countable covers of E by sets of the form $B_u(x,\sigma)$ with $u \geq n$. We set

$$C(E;t,n,\sigma,f) := \inf_{\mathcal{C}\in\mathcal{G}_n(E,\sigma)} \sum_{B_u(x,\sigma)\in\mathcal{C}} e^{-tu}$$

and

$$C(E;t,\sigma,f) := \lim_{n\to\infty} C(E;t,n,\sigma,f).$$

Then we define

$$h^B_{\text{top}}(E;\sigma,f) := \inf\{t : C(E;t,\sigma,f) = 0\} = \sup\{t : C(E;t,\sigma,f) = \infty\}$$

The *Bowen topological entropy* of E is

$$h^B_{\text{top}}(f,E) := \lim_{\sigma\to 0} h^B_{\text{top}}(E;\sigma,f). \tag{2.6}$$

2.3.3. *packing topological entropy.* Let $E \subset X$. For $s \geq 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$P^s_{N,\varepsilon}(E) = \sup \sum_i \exp(-sn_i),$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite or countable pairwise disjoint families $\{\overline{B}_{n_i}(x_i,\varepsilon)\}$ such that $x_i \in E$, $n_i \geq N$ for all i. The quantity $P^s_{N,\varepsilon}(E)$ does not decrease as N, ε decrease, hence the following limit exists:

$$P^s_\varepsilon(E) = \lim_{n\to\infty} P^s_{N,\varepsilon}(E).$$

Define

$$\mathcal{P}^s_\varepsilon(E) = \inf\{\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} P^s_\varepsilon(E_i) \colon \bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} E_i \supset E\}$$

and

$$h^P_{\text{top}}(E;\varepsilon,f) = \inf\{t \colon \mathcal{P}^s_\varepsilon(E) = 0\} = \sup\{t \colon \mathcal{P}^s_\varepsilon(E) = \infty\}.$$

For $E \subset X$ we define its *packing topological entropy* by:

$$h^P_{\text{top}}(f,E) := \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} h^P_{\text{top}}(E;\varepsilon,f)$$

Next we present a few simple relations between different types of entropy defined above (see [12, Proposition 2.1]). These relations will be very useful in our further considerations.

Lemma 2.2. *(1) For $E \subset E'$ we have:*

$$h^B_{top}(f,E) \leq h^B_{top}(f,E'), \quad h^P_{top}(f,E) \leq h^P_{top}(f,E'), \quad h^{UC}_{top}(f,E) \leq h^{UC}_{top}(f,E').$$

(2) For any $E \subset X$,

$$h^B_{top}(f,E) \leq h^P_{top}(f,E) \leq h^{UC}_{top}(f,E).$$

(3) If E is compact and f-invariant, then

$$h^B_{top}(f,E) = h^P_{top}(f,E) = h^{UC}_{top}(f,E).$$

In particular, when $E = X$, the above three kinds of topological entropy serve as equivalent definitions of the classical topological entropy $h_{\rm top}(f)$ defined in [1] using open covers.

3. Some auxiliary lemmas

First, we will need the following combinatorial lemma which allows us to construct large separated sets.

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be a compact metric space and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(X)$ be ergodic with $h_\mu(f) > 0$. Then for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each neighbourhood F of μ in $\mathcal{M}(M)$, there exists $n_F \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq n_F$, there exists $\Gamma_n \subset M_{n,F} \cap supp(\mu)$ which is (n,ε)-separated and satisfies $|\Gamma_n| \geq e^{n(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}$, where $M_{n,F} := \{x \in M : \mathcal{E}_n(x) \in F\}$.*

Proof. Fix any ergodic measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(X)$. For any $n \geq 0$ and any $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ let $N_f(n,\varepsilon,\delta)$ denote the minimal number of (n,ε)-balls which cover the set of μ-measure more or equal to $1-\delta$. Using the above notation, Katok proved in [14, Theorem 1.1] the following generalization of Bowen's formula for topological entropy:

$$h_\mu(f) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln N_f(n,\varepsilon,\delta)}{n}, \tag{3.7}$$

Since μ is ergodic, the set G_μ of points generic for μ has full μ-measure. But for every generic point x we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_n(x) = \mu$. Note that $G_\mu = \bigcup_n D_n$ where $D_n = \{x \in G_\mu : \mathcal{E}_n(x) \in F\}$ and $D_n \subset M_{n,F}$ hence there exists $N_1 > 0$ such that $\mu(M_{n,F} \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)) \geq 1-\delta$.

Fix any $\eta > 0$. By (3.7), there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n_F \geq N_1$ such that for any $n \geq n_F$ we have:

$$N_f(n,\varepsilon,\delta) \geq e^{n(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Denote $Z = M_{n,F} \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ and observe that (3.8) implies that

$$r_n(Z,\varepsilon) \geq e^{n(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}.$$

By the inequality (2.4), there exists (n,ε)-separated set $\Gamma_n \subset Z$ which satisfies

$$|\Gamma_n| \geq e^{n(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}.$$

The proof is completed. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X,f) be a dynamical system. Fix any $\alpha > 0$ and assume that there are $m,k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\log(m)/k > \alpha$ and a closed set $\Lambda \subset X$ invariant under f^k such that there is a factor map $\pi\colon (\Lambda, f^k) \to (\Sigma^+_{m+1}, \sigma)$. Then there exists an ergodic measure μ such that*

$$h_\mu(f) > \alpha \tag{3.9}$$

and there is an ergodic measure ν such that $\mu \neq \nu$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$.

Proof. Recall that dynamical system (X,f) is proximal, if

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} d(f^n(x), f^n(y)) = 0$$

for every $x,y \in X$. Equivalently, it means that the only minimal subset of X is the unique fixed point in X (e.g. see [2]).

Take any $\gamma > 0$ such that $(1-\gamma)\log(m)/k > \alpha$. Fix any increasing sequences of positive integers k_n, s_n such that s_n divides s_{n+1}, $k_{n+1} < s_n$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{k_i}{s_i} < \gamma.$$

Now let A be a set consisting of points $x \in \Sigma_{m+1}^+$ such that $x_i = 0$ when $i (\mathrm{mod}\ s_n) \geq (s_n - k_n)$ and $x_i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ otherwise. Denote $X = \overline{\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \sigma^i(A)}$. Since every element of A has syndetic occurrence of block 0^{k_n} (next such block occurs after at most $2s_n$ positions), also every element of X has this property. It immediately implies that $0^\infty \in \omega(x)$ for every $x \in X$, hence $\{0^\infty\}$ is the unique minimal subset of X. Therefore dynamical system (X, σ) is proximal. Let us estimate its entropy.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{s_n} \log \# B_{s_n}(X) &\geq \frac{1}{s_n} \log \# \left\{ w : w = x_{[0,s_n)]}, x \in A \right\} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{s_n} \log m^{(s_n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{k_i s_n}{s_i})} \\
&\geq (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{k_i}{s_i}) \log(m) \geq (1-\gamma)\log(m).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $h_{\mathrm{top}}(X) \geq (1-\gamma)\log(m)$.

Denote $\Gamma = \pi^{-1}(X)$ and let $Z = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} f^i(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} f^i(\Gamma)$. Then

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(f|_Z) \geq \frac{1}{k} h_{\mathrm{top}}(f^k|_\Gamma) \geq (1-\gamma)\log(m)/k > \alpha.$$

Denote by D the smallest invariant subset for f containing the set $\pi^{-1}(0^\infty)$. Then clearly $D \subset Z$ and every minimal system E in Z must be a subsystem of D. Simply $E \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ and $E \cap Z$ is a union of minimal sets for f^k. But then the only possibility is that $\pi(E \cap Z) = 0^\infty$ showing that $E \cap Z \subset D$, and since D is invariant we have $E \subset D$.

Let (Y, g) be a system obtained by collapsing D to a single point, where g is an appropriate quotient map obtained form f. Then we have a natural factor map $\eta\colon (Z, f) \to (Y, g)$. Let $\tilde{\Gamma}$ be obtained form Γ by collapsing $D \cap \Gamma$. Then $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset Y$ and we also obtain an induced map $\tilde{\eta}\colon \tilde{\Gamma} \to X$ such that $\pi = \tilde{\eta} \circ \eta$. Among other things, it implies that $h_{\mathrm{top}}(g) > N$. Let μ be an ergodic measure with $h_\mu(g) > \alpha$ obtained by the variational principle. Note that (Y, g) is proximal, since there are no minimal subsets in it other that the fixed point p obtained by the collapse of D in Z. But then, by ergodic theorem $\mu(\{p\}) = 0$. Observe that η is one-to-one everywhere outside D and hence we may view μ as a measure on Z with $\mu(D) = 0$. Clearly this backward projection by η does not change entropy of μ. To complete the proof, it is enough to take as ν any ergodic measure supported on some minimal set contained in the invariant set $D \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that a dynamical system (X, f) acting on a compact metric space X has the shadowing property and suppose that there exists $\alpha > 0$ and an ergodic measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(X)$ with $h_\mu(f) > \alpha$. Then there are $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\log(m)/k > \alpha$ and a closed set $\Lambda \subset X$ invariant under f^k such that there is a factor map $\pi\colon (\Lambda, f^k) \to (\Sigma_{m+1}^+, \sigma)$*

Proof. Fix any $\eta > 0$ such that $h_\mu(f) - 4\eta > \alpha$. By Lemma 3.1 there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq N$, there exists $\Gamma_n \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ which is (n, ε)-separated and satisfies $|\Gamma_n| \geq e^{n(h_\mu(f) - \eta)}$.

Let $\delta > 0$ be such that every δ-pseudo orbit is $\varepsilon/3$ traced and Cover $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ by opens sets $U_1, \ldots, U_s$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(U_i) < \delta$ for every i. Since μ is ergodic,

$f|_{supp(\mu)}$ is transitive [30]. Thus for every $1 \le i, j \le s$, there exsits a point $z_{ij} \in U_i$ such that $f^{k_{ij}}(z_i) \in U_j$ for some $k_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote

$$K = \max_{1 \le i,j \le s} \{k_{ij}\}.$$

Now we choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough such that

$$2\log(s)/n < \eta, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\frac{n}{n+K} h_\mu(f) < h_\mu(f) - \eta. \tag{3.11}$$

For every n denote by $\Gamma_n^{ij} = \{z \in \Gamma_n : z \in U_i, f^n(z) \in U_j\}$. Clearly there always exist $1 \le i, j \le s$ such that $|\Gamma_n^{ij}| \ge |\Gamma_n|/s^2$. By (3.10), we have

$$|\Gamma_n^{ij}| \ge e^{n(h_\mu(f)-2\eta)}.$$

Enumerate elements of Γ_n^{ij}, say $\Gamma_n^{ij} = \{p_0, \dots, p_{r-1}\}$ where $r = |\Gamma_n^{ij}|$. Define m finite sequences, putting for $l = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$:

$$\eta(l) = (p_l, f(p_l), \dots, f^{n-1}(p_l)), z_{ji}, f(z_{ji}), \dots, f^{k_{ji}-1}(z_{ji}).$$

If we denote by k length $k = |\eta(l)| = n + k_{ij} \le n + K$ then all sequences $\eta(l)$ are δ-pseudo orbits, and since $f^{k_{ji}}(z_{ji}) \in U_i \supset \Gamma_n^{ij}$ we can freely concatenate sequences $\eta(l)$ obtaining again longer δ-pseudo orbits.

Let Σ_r^+ be the set of element $a = (a_0 a_1 \dots a_n \dots)$ such that $a_i \in \{p_0, \dots, p_{r-1}\}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For every $\xi \in \Sigma_r^+$, denote

$$Y_\xi = \{z : d(f^{ik}(z), \xi_i) \le \varepsilon/3 \text{ for } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}.$$

By the choice of δ and the shadowing property of (X, f) we see that each set Y_ξ is nonempty. It is also clear that each such set is a closed subset of X. Note that if $\xi \ne \psi$ then there is t such that $\xi_t \ne \psi_t$. But then there is $r < n$ such that $d(f^r(p_{\xi_t}), f^r(p_{\psi_t})) \ge \varepsilon$. This immediately implies that $Y_\xi \cap Y_\psi = \emptyset$. Denote

$$\Lambda = \bigcup_{\xi \in \Sigma_r^+} Y_\xi$$

Note that $f^k(Y_\xi) \subset Y_{\sigma(\xi)}$, then Λ is an invariant set for f^k. It is also not hard to see that if $y \in Y_\xi$, $z \in Y_\psi$ and $d(f^l(x), f^l(y)) < \varepsilon/3$ for $l = 0, \dots, ks-1$ then $\xi_i = \psi_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, s-1$. So we can write Λ as the disjoint union of Y_ξ:

$$\Lambda = \bigsqcup_{\xi \in \Sigma_r^+} Y_\xi.$$

Therefore, if we define $\pi \colon \Lambda \to \Sigma_r^+$ as

$$\pi(x) := \xi \text{ if } x \in Y_\xi,$$

then π is a continuous suriection. This shows that Λ is closed and clearly also $\sigma \circ \pi = \pi \circ f^k$. Finally put $m = r - 1$ and observe that

$$\frac{\log(m)}{k} = \frac{\log(r-1)}{k} \ge \frac{\log(r/2)}{k} = \frac{1}{k} n(h_\mu(f) - 3\eta) \ge h_\mu(f) - 4\eta > \alpha.$$

The proof is completed. □

Then it is enough to combine the Variational Principle with Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.2 to get the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *If (X, f) satisfies the shadowing property and $h_{top}(f) > 0$, then there exists a sequence of ergodic measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{M}_f(X)$ such that $h_{top}(f) = \lim_{n\to\infty} h_{\mu_n}(f)$ and for each n there is an ergodic measure ν_n such that $\mu_n \ne \nu_n$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\nu_n) \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu_n)$ (i.e. f restricted to $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_n)$ is not uniquely ergodic).*

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Theorem 4.1. *If f satisfies the shadowing property and $h_{top}(f) > 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} h_{top}(f) &= h^B_{top}(f, I(f)) = h^P_{top}(f, I(f)) = h^{UC}_{top}(f, I(f)) \\ &= \sup\{h_{top}(f|_\Lambda) \mid \Lambda \subset X \text{ is a closed invariant set with} \\ &\qquad f|_\Lambda \text{ transitive and not uniquely ergodic}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We claim that

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) = h^B_{\mathrm{top}}(f, I(f)) = \sup\{h_{\mathrm{top}}(f|_\Lambda) \mid \Lambda \subset X \text{ is a closed invariant set with } f|_\Lambda \text{ transitive and not uniquely ergodic}\}.$$

First we consider the case of $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f|_\Lambda) < \infty$ and divide our proof into four steps.

1. For any $\eta > 0$ find Λ with $f|_\Lambda$ transitive, non-uniquely ergodic, $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) - \eta < h_{\mathrm{top}}(f|_\Lambda)$ and establish enough pseudo-orbits;
2. Construct a Cantor set G;
3. Prove that $G \subset I(f)$;
4. Prove that $h^B_{\mathrm{top}}(f, G) > h_{\mathrm{top}}(f|_\Lambda) - 6\eta$.

Step 1. For any $\eta > 0$, by Corollary 3.4 we select an ergodic measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(\Lambda)$ such that

$$h_\mu(f) > h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) - \eta$$

and another ergodic measure ν with $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. Clearly f restricted to invariant set $\Lambda = \mathrm{supp}\,\mu$ is transitive (e.g. see [30]). Denote $d(\mu, \nu) = \alpha$ and let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$t(h_\mu(f) - 3\eta) \geq (t+1)(h_\mu(f) - 4\eta). \tag{4.12}$$

By Lemma 3.1, for μ, there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if we denote $F_1 = \mathcal{B}(\mu, \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}) \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$ then there exists $m_{F_1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq m_{F_1}$, there exists $\Gamma^\mu_n \subset M_{n,F_1} \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ which is (n, ε_1)-separated and satiesfies $|\Gamma^\mu_n| \geq e^{n(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}$.

Denote $F_2 = \mathcal{B}(\nu, \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)})$ and let $\Gamma^\nu_n = \{z\}$ for some generic point z for ν. Then there exists $m_{F_2} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Gamma^\nu_n \subset M_{n,F_2} \cap \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$ for any $n \geq m_{F_2}$.

Dynamical system (X, f) has the shadowing property, therefore for

$$\zeta = \min\{\frac{\alpha}{12(t+1)}, \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\}, \tag{4.13}$$

there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that any γ-pseudo-orbit can be ζ-shadowed by some point.

Since Λ is closed and thus compact, there exists a finite open cover $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^s$ of Λ with $\mathrm{diam}(U_i) < \gamma$, $i = 1, \cdots, s$. Since $f|_\Lambda$ is transitive, for any $1 \leq i, j \leq s$, there exist $n_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}$ and an orbit segment $\Delta_{ij} = \{f^k(y_{ij})\}_{k=0}^{n_{ij}}$ such that $y_{ij} \in U_i$ and $f^{n_{ij}}(y_{ij}) \in U_j$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} T &:= \max_{1 \leq i,j \leq s} \{n_{ij}\}, \\ L &:= \max\{m_{F_1}, m_{F_2}, \frac{48T(t+1)}{\alpha}, \frac{T(h_\mu(f) - 3\eta)}{\eta}, \frac{2\ln(s)}{\eta}, 5T\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by definition, there exist (L, ε)-separated sets $\Gamma^\mu_L \subset X_{L,F_1} \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ with

$$|\Gamma^\mu_L| \geq e^{L(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}. \tag{4.14}$$

and then by pigeonhole principle we obtain $\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu_L \subset \Gamma^\mu_L$ and $1 \leq i_1, j_1 \leq s$ such that $\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu_L \subset U_{i_1}$, $f^L(\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu_L) \subset U_{j_1}$ and

$$|\widetilde{\Gamma}^\mu_L| \geq |\Gamma^\mu_L|/s^2 \geq \frac{e^{L(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}}{s^2} \geq e^{L(h_\mu(f)-2\eta)}. \tag{4.15}$$

Take (the unique) $z \in \Gamma_L^\nu$ and let $1 \le i_2, j_2 \le s$ denote indexes such that $z \in U_{i_2}$ and $f^L(z) \in U_{j_2}$.

Step 2. Now, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let us inductively define

$$S_0 = 0,\ N_1 = 1,\ S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i \ \text{ and } N_n = BS_{n-1} \text{ for } n \ge 2,$$

where $B > \frac{48(t+1)}{\alpha}$ is a fixed integer. One can even solve N_n explicitly as $N_n = (B+1)^{n-1}$. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ define measure ω_m and integer l_m by the following procedure. If $m \in [S_{2k}(t+1)+1, S_{2k+1}(t+1)]$ for some $k \ge 0$, then we put

$$\omega_m = \mu \text{ and } l_m = n_{j_1 i_1}.$$

Otherwise, $m \in [S_{2k+1}(t+1)+1, S_{2k+2}(t+1)]$ for some $k \ge 0$. Then there are uniquely determined integers $r \in [0, N_{2k+1})$ and $\tilde{r} \in [1, t+1]$ such that $m = (S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)+\tilde{r}$. In this case, we put

$$\omega_m = \begin{cases} \mu & \text{, if } \tilde{r} \le t \\ \nu & \text{, if } \tilde{r} = t+1 \end{cases}, \qquad l_m = \begin{cases} n_{j_1 i_1} & \text{, if } \tilde{r} < t \\ n_{j_1 i_2} & \text{, if } \tilde{r} = t \\ n_{j_2 i_1} & \text{, if } \tilde{r} = t+1 \end{cases}$$

For each $m \ge 1$ put $\widetilde{\Gamma}_m = \widetilde{\Gamma}_L^{\omega_m}$ and select an arbitrary point $x_m \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_m$. Clearly, each $\widetilde{\Gamma}_m$ is a finite set. Furthermore, when $\omega_m = \mu$, the choice is not unique. Hence in what follows we construct a family of sequences rather than one concrete sequence. Set

$$M_m = mL + \sum_{i=1}^{m} l_i \tag{4.16}$$

and define a sequence $\{z_u\}_{u=0}^{\infty}$ as a concatenation of the following blocks.

First put $a = M_{(S_{2k}+r)(t+1)}$ and $b = M_{(S_{2k}+r+1)(t+1)} - 1$ for some $k \ge 0$ and $0 \le r < N_{2k+1}$. Then the segment $\{z_u\}_{u=a}^{b}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{(S_{2k}+r)(t+1)+1}, \cdots, f^{L-1}x_{(S_{2k}+r)(t+1)+1}, y_{j_1 i_1}, \cdots, f^{n_{j_1 i_1}-1}y_{j_1 i_1}, \\ &x_{(S_{2k}+r)(t+1)+2}, \cdots, f^{L-1}x_{(S_{2k}+r)(t+1)+2}, y_{j_1 i_1}, \cdots, f^{n_{j_1 i_1}-1}y_{j_1 i_1}, \\ &\qquad\qquad \vdots \\ &x_{(S_{2k}+r+1)(t+1)}, \cdots, f^{L-1}x_{(S_{2k}+r+1)(t+1)}, y_{j_1 i_1}, \cdots, f^{n_{j_1 i_1}-1}y_{j_1 i_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Complementary segments of the sequence, for indexes between $a = M_{(S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)}$ and $b = M_{(S_{2k+1}+r+1)(t+1)} + 1$ for some $k \ge 0$ and $0 \le r < N_{2k+1}$ have a more complicated structure. We define them by:

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{(S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)+1}, \cdots, f^{L-1}x_{(S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)+1}, y_{j_1 i_1}, \cdots, f^{n_{j_1 i_1}-1}y_{j_1 i_1}, \\ &\qquad\qquad \vdots \\ &x_{(S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)+t-1}, \cdots, f^{L-1}x_{(S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)+t-1}, y_{j_1 i_1}, \cdots, f^{n_{j_1 i_1}-1}y_{j_1 i_1}, \\ &x_{(S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)+t}, \cdots, f^{L-1}x_{(S_{2k+1}+r)(t+1)+t}, y_{j_1 i_2}, \cdots, f^{n_{j_1 i_2}-1}y_{j_1 i_2}, \\ &x_{(S_{2k+1}+r+1)(t+1)}, \cdots, f^{L-1}x_{(S_{2k+1}+r+1)(t+1)}, y_{j_2 i_1}, \cdots, f^{n_{j_2 i_1}-1}y_{j_2 i_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

By the selection of points $\{x_m\}_{m\ge1}$ and the definition of $y_{i_1 i_1}, y_{j_1 i_2}, y_{j_2 i_1}$ it is easy to see that $\{z_u\}_{u=0}^{\infty}$ constitutes a γ-pseudo-orbit. Thus by the shadowing property, $\{z_u\}_{u=0}^{\infty}$ is ζ-shadowed by some point in X.

For $d \geq 1$ and $z_1 \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_1, \ldots, z_d \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_m$, denote

$$G_d(z_1, \ldots, z_d) := \bigcap_{m=1}^{d} f^{-M_{m-1}} \overline{B_L(z_m, \zeta)},$$

$$G_d := \bigcap_{m=1}^{d} \bigcup_{x_m \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_m} f^{-M_{m-1}} \overline{B_L(x_m, \zeta)}.$$

Observe that both $G_d(z_1, \ldots, z_d)$ and G_d are nonempty closed sets. Moreover, for $d \geq 1$, we have inclusions

$$G_d(z_1, \ldots, z_d) \supset G_{d+1}(z_1, \ldots, z_d, z_{d+1})$$
$$G_d \supset G_{d+1}.$$

which implies that the following sets are closed and nonempty:

$$G(z_1, z_2, \ldots) := \bigcap_{d \geq 1} G_d(z_1, \ldots, z_d)$$
$$G := \bigcap_{d \geq 1} G_d.$$

Let $x_d, y_d \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_d$ with $x_d \neq y_d$. Since x_d and y_d are (L, ε)-separated, there exists $0 \leq l < L$ such that

$$d(f^l x_d, f^l y_d) > \varepsilon,$$

therefore, if $x \in B_L(x_d, \zeta)$ and $y \in B_L(y_d, \zeta)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d(f^l x, f^l y) &\geq d(f^l x_d, f^l y_d) - d(f^l x_d, f^l x) - d(f^l y_d, f^l y) \\ &> \varepsilon - 2\zeta > \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \end{aligned}$$

by the selection of ζ in (4.13). This implies that

$$G_d(z_1, \ldots, z_{d-1}, x_d) \cap G_d(z_1, \ldots, z_{d-1}, y_d) = \emptyset$$

which shows that G is a closed set which is a disjoint union of closed sets $G(x_1, x_2, \cdots)$ labeled by $(x_1, x_2, \cdots)$ with $x_m \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_m$ for each m. In other words, two different sequences label two different sets.

Step 3. Next we are going to prove that

$$G \subset I(f). \tag{4.19}$$

Let z be a point corresponding to some closed set $z \in G(x_1, x_2, \cdots)$ with $x_m \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_m$. Then z ζ-shadows some γ-pseudo-orbit $\{z_u\}_{u=0}^{\infty}$ constructed above. Since for every $x, y \in X$ we have $\rho(\delta_x, \delta_y) = d(x, y)$, thus it is easily seen that

$$\rho(\mathcal{E}_n(z), \frac{\sum_{u=0}^{n-1} \delta_{z_u}}{n}) \leq \zeta, \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.20}$$

Since $x_m \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_m$, we have

$$\rho(\mathcal{E}_L(x_m), \omega_m) \leq \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)} \tag{4.21}$$

by the selection of the neighbourhood F_1 and F_2. Therefore, Lemma 2.1 (3) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\mathcal{E}_{L+l_m}(x_m), \omega_m) &\leq \rho(\mathcal{E}_L(x_m), \omega_m) + \rho(\mathcal{E}_L(x_m), \mathcal{E}_{L+l_m}(x_m)) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)} + \frac{2T}{L}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the selection of L in (4.14), and using Lemma 2.1, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho(\mathcal{E}_{S_{2k-1}(t+1)L+\sum_{m=1}^{S_{2k-1}(t+1)} l_m}(z),\mu)\\
&\quad\le \frac{N_{2k-1}}{S_{2k-1}}(\frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}+\frac{2T}{L})+\frac{S_{2k-2}}{S_{2k-1}}\cdot 2+\zeta\\
&\quad\le \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}+\frac{2T}{L}+\frac{2}{B}+\frac{\alpha}{12(t+1)}\\
&\quad\le \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}+\frac{\alpha}{24(t+1)}+\frac{\alpha}{24(t+1)}+\frac{\alpha}{12(t+1)}\\
&\quad\le \frac{\alpha}{3(t+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, if we put

$$\beta=\frac{tL+(t-1)n_{j_1i_1}+n_{j_1i_2}}{(t+1)L+(t-1)n_{j_1i_1}+n_{j_1i_2}+n_{i_2j_1}}$$

then by Lemma 2.1, similarly as before we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho(\mathcal{E}_{S_{2k}(t+1)L+\sum_{m=1}^{S_{2k}(t+1)} l_m}(z),\beta\mu+(1-\beta)\nu)\\
&\quad\le \frac{N_{2k}}{S_{2k}}\left(\beta(\frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}+\frac{2T}{L})+(1-\beta)(\frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}+\frac{2T}{L})\right)+\frac{2S_{2k-1}}{S_{2k}}+\zeta\\
&\quad\le \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}+\frac{2T}{L}+\frac{2}{B}+\zeta\\
&\quad\le \frac{\alpha}{6(t+1)}+\frac{\alpha}{24(t+1)}+\frac{\alpha}{24(t+1)}+\frac{\alpha}{12(t+1)}\\
&\quad\le \frac{\alpha}{3(t+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now it is enough to observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\mu,\beta\mu+(1-\beta)\nu) &= \alpha(1-\beta)\ge\frac{L}{(L+T)(t+1)}\alpha\ge\frac{5\alpha}{6(t+1)}\\
&> \frac{\alpha}{3(t+1)}+\frac{\alpha}{3(t+1)},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\{\mathcal{E}_n(z)\}_{n\ge1}$ diverges, i.e. $z\in I(f)$.

Step 4. Let $h=h_\mu(f)-5\eta>h_{\rm top}(f)-6\eta$. We are going to show that

$$h^B_{\rm top}(f,G)\ge h. \tag{4.22}$$

Recall that $h^B_{\rm top}(f,G)$ is defined in (2.6) and we will follow notation introduced there. Since $C(G;s,\sigma,f)$ is a non-increasing function of σ, it is enough to prove that there exists $\widetilde{\sigma}>0$ such that

$$C(G;h,\widetilde{\sigma},f)\ge 1. \tag{4.23}$$

In fact, we will prove that (4.23) holds for $\widetilde{\sigma}=\frac{\varepsilon}{6}$.

By definition,

$$C(G;h,\frac{\varepsilon}{6},f)=\lim_{n\to\infty}C(G;h,n,\frac{\varepsilon}{6},f)$$

and

$$C(G;h,n,\frac{\varepsilon}{6},f)=\inf_{\mathcal{C}\in\mathcal{G}_n(G,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})}\sum_{B_u(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\in\mathcal{C}}e^{-hu}.$$

Since G is compact, we can consider the finite covers $\mathcal{C}\in\mathcal{G}_n(G,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})$ of G. We may also assume that if $B_u(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\in\mathcal{C}$ then $B_u(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\cap G\neq\emptyset$, since otherwise we may

remove this set form $\mathcal{C}$ and it still remains as cover of G. It is enough to show that for n large enough, we have

$$\sum_{B_u(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\in\mathcal{C}} e^{-hu} \geq 1. \tag{4.24}$$

Let q be an integer such that

$$\frac{q+1}{q} \leq \frac{h_\mu(f)-3\eta}{h_\mu(f)-2\eta}\cdot\frac{h_\mu(f)-4\eta}{h_\mu(f)-5\eta}, \tag{4.25}$$

We claim that for any $n \geq M_q$ condition (4.24) holds.

Let us fix any $n \geq M_q$. For each $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{G}_n(G,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})$, we define the cover $\mathcal{C}'$ in which each ball $B_u(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})$ is replaced by $B_{M_m}(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})$, $M_m \leq u < M_{m+1}$, $m \geq q$ where M_m defined in (4.16). Then

$$\sum_{B_u(x,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\in\mathcal{C}} e^{-hu} \geq \sum_{B_{M_m}(x,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\in\mathcal{C}'} e^{-hM_{m+1}}. \tag{4.26}$$

Consider a specific $\mathcal{C}'$ and let c be the largest value of m for which there exists $B_{M_m}(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6}) \in \mathcal{C}'$. Define

$$\mathcal{W}_l := \prod_{i=1}^{l} \widetilde{\Gamma}_i,\ \mathcal{V}_c := \bigcup_{l=1}^{c} \mathcal{W}_l$$

where sets $\widetilde{\Gamma}_i$ are defined in Step 2 just before (4.16). If $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $v \in \mathcal{W}_j$ then we say that v is a *prefix* of $w \in \mathcal{W}_k$ if the first j coordinates of w coincide with v. Note that each $p \in \mathcal{W}_m$ is a prefix of exactly $|\mathcal{W}_c|/|\mathcal{W}_m|$ words of $\mathcal{W}_c$. If $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{V}_c$ contains a prefix of each word of $\mathcal{W}_c$, then

$$\sum_{m=1}^{c} |\mathcal{W}\cap\mathcal{W}_m|\frac{|\mathcal{W}_c|}{|\mathcal{W}_m|} \geq |\mathcal{W}_c|.$$

To see this, it is enough to note that for each word of $\mathcal{W}_c$, one of its prefixes must be contained in some $\mathcal{W}\cap\mathcal{W}_m$ for some $1 \leq m \leq c$. Moreover, the number of words in $\mathcal{W}_c$ with this prefix does not exceed $|\mathcal{W}_c|/|\mathcal{W}_m|$. Thus if $\mathcal{W}$ contains a prefix of each word of $\mathcal{W}_c$,

$$\sum_{m=1}^{c} |\mathcal{W}\cap\mathcal{W}_m|/|\mathcal{W}_m| \geq 1. \tag{4.27}$$

Note that since $\mathcal{C}'$ is a cover of G, $\mathcal{C}'$ corresponds to a subset $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{V}_c$ such that $\mathcal{W}$ contains a prefix of each word of $\mathcal{W}_c$. More precisely, as discussed at the end of Step 2, each $x \in B_{M_m}(z,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\cap G$ corresponds to a closed set $G(x_1,x_2,\cdots,x_m) \supset G$, and thus corresponds to a point in $\mathcal{W}_m$. Moreover, sequence $x_1,\ldots,x_m$ is uniquely defined since, if the converse is true, it is not hard to see that there exists $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $x_i, y_i \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_L^\mu$ with $x_i \neq y_i$ such that

$$f^{M_{i-1}}(z) \in B_L(x_i,\frac{\varepsilon}{6}+\frac{\varepsilon}{3})\cap B_L(y_i,\frac{\varepsilon}{6}+\frac{\varepsilon}{3}).$$

This leads to

$$d_L(x_i,y_i) \leq d_L(x_i,f^{M_{i-1}}(z)) + d_L(y_i,f^{M_{i-1}}(z)) < \varepsilon,$$

which contradicts the fact that x_i and y_i are (L,ε)-separated.

Thus (4.27) gives

$$\sum_{B_{M_m}(x,\varepsilon)\in\mathcal{C}'} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_m|} \geq 1. \tag{4.28}$$

By the selection of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_m$ we see that the average number of occurrences of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_L^{\nu}$ does not exceed $1/(t+1)$ and therefore we have

$$|\mathcal{W}_m| \geq \left(\frac{e^{L(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}}{s^2}\right)^{\frac{mt}{t+1}}. \tag{4.29}$$

Recall that by the selection of L we have

$$\frac{e^{L(h_\mu(f)-\eta)}}{s^2} \geq e^{L(h_\mu(f)-2\eta)}, \tag{4.30}$$

$$L(h_\mu(f)-2\eta) \geq (L+T)(h_\mu(f)-3\eta), \tag{4.31}$$

$$m(L+T) \geq M_m. \tag{4.32}$$

Combining (4.29)–(4.32) and (4.12) we have

$$|\mathcal{W}_m| \geq e^{m(L+T)(h_\mu(f)-4\eta)} \geq e^{M_m(h_\mu(f)-4\eta)}.$$

which by (4.28) gives

$$\sum_{B_{M_m}(x,\varepsilon)\in\mathcal{C}'} e^{-M_m(h_\mu(f)-4\eta)} \geq 1. \tag{4.33}$$

On the other hand, by the selection of q in (4.25) and the inequality (4.31), we easily check that for $m \geq q$,

$$\frac{M_{m+1}}{M_m} \leq \frac{(m+1)(L+T)}{mL} \leq \frac{q+1}{q}\cdot\frac{h_\mu(f)-2\eta}{h_\mu(f)-3\eta} \leq \frac{h_\mu(f)-4\eta}{h_\mu(f)-5\eta}$$

which implies that

$$hM_{m+1} = M_{m+1}(h_\mu(f)-5\eta) \leq M_m(h_\mu(f)-4\eta). \tag{4.34}$$

Hence, for $n \geq M_q$, we can use (4.26), (4.33) and (4.34) to obtain that

$$\sum_{B_u(x,\frac{\varepsilon}{6})\in\mathcal{C}} e^{-hu} \geq 1,$$

which implies that

$$C(G;h,n,\frac{\varepsilon}{6},T) \geq 1.$$

Therefore, (4.23) holds and thus (4.22) is proved.

Thus, we have completed the proof of the case $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) < \infty$. For the case $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) = \infty$, it is enough to replace condition $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) - \eta < h_{\mathrm{top}}(f|_\Lambda)$ in Step 1 by $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f|_\Lambda) > \eta$. All the other arguments in the proof remain unchanged.

Indeed the claim holds. The proof is completed by Lemma 2.2, because

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) = h^B_{\mathrm{top}}(f, I(f)) \leq h^P_{\mathrm{top}}(f, I(f)) \leq h^{UC}_{\mathrm{top}}(f, I(f)) = h^{UC}_{\mathrm{top}}(f, X) = h_{\mathrm{top}}(f).$$

□

Now we are ready to prove our first main result. It was proved in [27] that if a dynamical system with shadowing property has a recurrent not minimal point, or minimal sensitive point then the entropy must be positive. A similar analysis will be performed here.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The case of $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) > 0$ is covered by Theorem 4.1. For the remaining case, assume on the contrary that $h_{\mathrm{top}}(f) = 0$ and $I(f) \neq \emptyset$. Let $x \in X$ be such that $\mathcal{E}_n(x)$ diverges. Take two distinct invariant measures μ, ν that are accumulation points of the sequence $\mathcal{E}_n(x)$. First assume that $\mathrm{supp}(\mu) \neq \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathrm{supp}(\mu) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\nu) \neq \emptyset$. Fix any recurrent point $z \in \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$. We claim that z is a sensitive point. To see that, fix any $y \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_{3\varepsilon}(y) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\nu) = \emptyset$. Fix any $\eta \in (0, \varepsilon)$, put $U = B_\eta(y)$, $V = B_\eta(z)$ and observe that $\mu(U) > 0$ and $\nu(V) > 0$. In

particular, there is $\delta > 0$ and increasing sequences n_i, m_i such that $\mathcal{E}_{n_i}(x)(U) > \delta$ and $\mathcal{E}_{m_i}(x)(V) > \delta$. In particular, there is a point $q \in X$ and $0 < n < m$ such that

$$d(q, z) < \eta, \quad d(f^m(q), z) < \eta, \quad d(f^n(q), f^n(z)) \geq \operatorname{dist}(f^n(q), \operatorname{supp}(\nu)) > \varepsilon.$$

Since z is a recurrent point we can repeat argument similar to those in Lemma 3.3 and show that $h_{\text{top}}(f) > 0$ (see also [18]). This is a contradiction, hence the only possibility is that $\operatorname{supp}(\mu) = \operatorname{supp}(\nu)$. If $\operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ is not a minimal set, then we can replace ν by a measure supported on a minimal set $Y \subsetneq \operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ and repeat previous argument showing that $h_{\text{top}}(f) > 0$. Therefore the only possibility is that $\operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ is a minimal set. By [18] there is no sensitive point in $\operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ hence $(\operatorname{supp}(\mu), f|_{\operatorname{supp}(\mu)})$ is an equicontinuous minimal system. But all such systems are uniquely ergodic (e.g. see [5]) which gives $\mu = \nu$. This is again a contradiction, which completes the proof. □

5. Proof for Theorem 1.3

In this section, we need to use the shredding lemma which originally appeared in [3]. It was used to prove that generic $f \in C(M)$ (resp. H(M)) is weird, where M is a compact connected boundaryless smooth manifold. However, in the proof of the shredding lemma, they just considered a manifold with a "triangulation", while the shredding lemma still holds. Here, by a "triangulation", they mean a finite collection $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i \in I}$ of compact set of M homeomorphic to (say) the simplex

$$\Delta_d = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i \leq 1 \text{ and } x_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } i\}$$

together with homeomorphisms $\xi_i \colon R_i \to \Delta_d$, such that $m(\partial R_i) = 0$ for every i and such that if $i \neq j$ then (i) either $R_i \cap R_j = \emptyset$ or (ii) $R_i \cap R_j \subset \partial R_i$.

They also pointed out that any measure with no atom and full support can replace the original volume measure m to get the same conclusion. Both facts bring lots of convenience in our case. It is not hard to check that our manifold with a decomposition also satisfies such a "triangulation" with m replaced by $\mathscr{L}$. So we also obtain a shredding lemma here.

Lemma 5.1 (Shredding Lemma)**.** *Let M ba a compact manifold of dimension at least 2 which admits a decomposition. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a dense set $C_\varepsilon \subset H(M)$ (resp. $C_\varepsilon \subset C(M)$) such that for very $f \in C_\varepsilon$ there are pairwise disjoint open sets $V_1, \ldots, V_N$ such that:*

(i) $f(\overline{V_j}) \subset V_j$, $\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$;
(ii) $\mathscr{L}(V_j) < \varepsilon$, $\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$;
(iii) $\mathscr{L}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} V_j) > 1 - \varepsilon$;
(iv) $\mathscr{L}(f(V_j)) < \varepsilon \cdot \mathscr{L}(V_j)$, $\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$;;
(v) each V_j is contained in a basin of attraction of a periodic cycle of sets, i.e. there are open sets $W_j^0, \ldots, W_j^{k_j - 1}$ such that
  (a) $\operatorname{diam}(W_j^i) < \varepsilon$ *for* $i = 0, \ldots, k_j - 1$;
  (b) $f(W_j^i) \subset W_j^{i+1 \ (mod\ k_j)}$ *for* $i = 0, \ldots, k_j - 1$;
  (c) $\overline{V_j} \subset \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(\bigcup_{i=0}^{k_j - 1}(W_j^i))$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We divide the proof into four intermediate steps, to make it more readable.

Step 1: *Construction of $\Lambda \subset M$ with full $\mathscr{L}-$measure.*

Observe that each C_ε is open and hence the following set is residual

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Fix $f \in \mathcal{R}$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let U_n be the union of the open set V_i corresponding to $C_{\frac{1}{n}}$. Denote

$$\Lambda = \bigcap_{k\geq 1} \bigcup_{n\geq k} U_n \tag{5.35}$$

and observe that since $\mathscr{L}(U_n) > 1 - \frac{1}{n}$, we have $\mathscr{L}(\Lambda) = 1$.

Step 2: $\Lambda \subset Q(f) \cap \Delta$.

That $\Lambda \subset Q(f)$ is contained in [3, Theorem 3.6]. Hence for every $x \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{E}_n(x)$ converges to some invariant measure μ. It is left to show that μ is a SRB-like measure. By definition, it is enough to show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, the set

$$A_\epsilon(\mu) = \{y \in X : \ d(p\omega(y), \mu) > 0\}$$

has positive Lebesgue measure. However, since $\Lambda = \bigcap_{n\geq 1} \bigcup_{m\geq n} U_m$ and U_m is the union of sets of R_i^δ, we select an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{n} < \epsilon$. Then there exists a $m \geq n$ such that $x \in U_m$. By our construction of U_m, there exist $I(m)$ open sets R_i^δ with $\operatorname{diam}(R_i^\delta) < \frac{1}{m} < \epsilon$ such that

$$U_m = \bigsqcup_{1\leq i\leq I(m)} R_i^\delta \text{ and } fR_i^\delta \subset R_{\tau(i)}^\delta, \ 1 \leq i \leq I(m).$$

Let $d_m = \max_{1\leq i\leq I(m)} \operatorname{diam}(R_i^\delta)$ and suppose $x \in R_j^\delta$. One has

$$d(f^n x, f^n y) \leq d_m < \epsilon,$$

which implies that

$$\rho(\mathcal{E}_n(x), \mathcal{E}_n(y)) \leq d_m < \epsilon$$

for any $y \in R_j^\delta$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the definition of μ and $p\omega(y)$, there exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$d(\mu, \mathcal{E}_k(x)) < \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon - d_m) \text{ and } d(p\omega(y), \mathcal{E}_k(y)) < \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon - d_m).$$

Then the triangle inequality gives that

$$\begin{aligned} d(p\omega(y), \mu) &\leq d(p\omega(y), \mathcal{E}_k(y)) + d(\mathcal{E}_k(y), \mathcal{E}_k(x)) + d(\mathcal{E}_k(x), \mu) \\ &< \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon - d_m) + d_m + \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon - d_m) = \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $R_j^\delta \subset A_\epsilon(\mu)$. Thus we have

$$m(A_\epsilon(\mu)) \geq m(R_j^\delta) > 0$$

which completes our proof.

Step 3: $h_{\text{top}}^B(f, \Lambda) = h_{\text{top}}^P(f, \Lambda) = h_{\text{top}}^{UC}(f, \Lambda) = 0$.

First we clam that $h_{\text{top}}^{UC}(f, \Lambda) = 0$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and an integer $k > 0$ such that $1/k < \varepsilon$. By (5.35) we see that $\Lambda \subset \bigcup_{n\geq k} U_n$ where U_n is the union of the open set V_i corresponding to $C_{\frac{1}{n}}$ from Lemma 5.1. Therefore, if we fix any $x \in X$ then $x \in U_n$ for some n and hence by Lemma 5.1 there is an open set W such that

$$\operatorname{diam} f^j(W) < 1/n < \varepsilon, \ \forall \ j \geq 0$$

and $i \geq 0$ such that $f^i(x) \in W$. Then there is an open neighborhood U_x such that $\operatorname{diam} f^j(U_x) < \varepsilon$ for $j = 0, \ldots, i$ and $f^i(U_x) \subset W$. This implies that for every $y \in U_x$ we have $d(f^j(x), f^j(y)) < \varepsilon$ for every $j \geq 0$.

Fix any compact set $Z \subset \Lambda$. Then there are points $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ such that $Z \subset \cup_{i=1}^s U_{x_i}$. But then, for every $y \in Z$ we have x_i such that $y \in U_{x_i}$, hence

$$d(f^j(y), f^j(x_i)) < \varepsilon, \ \forall \ j \geq 0.$$

This implies that

$$s_j(Z, 2\varepsilon) \leq r_j(Z, \varepsilon) < s, \ \forall \ j \geq 0.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $h^{UC}_{\text{top}}(f, Z) = 0$. But compact set $Z \subset \Lambda$ was arbitrary too, hence $h^{UC}_{\text{top}}(f, \Lambda) = 0$. Indeed, the claim holds. Now by Lemma 2.2 we obtain that

$$0 \leq h^{B}_{\text{top}}(f, \Lambda) \leq h^{P}_{\text{top}}(f, \Lambda) \leq h^{UC}_{\text{top}}(f, \Lambda) = 0.$$

Step 4: On one hand, generic $f \in C(M)$ [17] and generic $f \in H(M)$ [15, 16] has shadowing property. On the other hand, [16, 31] show that for generic $f \in C(M)$ (resp. $H(M)$), $h_{\text{top}}(f) = \infty$. Thus by Theorem 1.2, we obtain that

$$h^{B}_{\text{top}}(f, I(f)) = h^{P}_{\text{top}}(f, I(f)) = h^{UC}_{\text{top}}(f, I(f)) = \infty$$

completing the proof. □

Acknowlegement.

The authors are grateful to Jian Li for his numerous remarks and fruitful discussions on relations between entropies considered in the paper.

Research of P. Oprocha was supported by the European Regional Development Fund in the IT4Innovations Center of Excellence project (CZ.1.05/1.1.00/02.0070).

The research of X. Tian was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant no. 11301088).

References

[1] R.L. Adler, A.G. Konheim, M.H. McAndrew, *Topological entropy*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **114** (1965), 309-319.
[2] E. Akin and S. Kolyada, *Li-Yorke sensitivity*, Nonlinearity, **16** (2003), 1421–1433.
[3] F. Abdenur and M. Andersson, *Ergodic theory of generic continuous maps*. Comm. Math. Phys., **318** (2013), 831-855.
[4] L. Barreira, J. Schmeling. *Sets of non-typical points have full topological entropy and full Hausdorff dimension*, Israel Journal of Mathematics, **116** (2000), 29-70.
[5] J.R. Brown, *Ergodic theory and topological dynamics*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 70. Academic Press, New York-London, 1976.
[6] E. Catsigeras and H. Enrich, *SRB-like measures for C^0 dynamics*, Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math., **59** (2011), 151-164.
[7] L. Che and S. Li, *Shadowing property for inverse limit spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **115** (1992), 573–580.
[8] E. Chen, K. Tassilo and L. Shu, *Topological entropy for divergence points*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys., **25** (2005), 1173-1208.
[9] M. Denker, C. Grillenberger and K. Sigmund, *Ergodic theory on the compact spaces*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 527, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
[10] K. J. Falconer, Fractal geometry: mathematical foundation and applications (John Wiley, New York, 1990).
[11] A. Fan, D. Feng and J. Wu, *Recurrence, dimensions and entropy*, J. London Math. Soc., **64** (2001), 229-244.
[12] D. Feng, W. Huang, *Variational principles for topological entropies of subsets*, J. Funct. Anal., **263** (2012), 2228–2254.
[13] J. P. Kahane, Some series of random functions (Cambridge University Press, 1985).
[14] A. Katok, *Lyapunov exponents, entropy and periodic orbits for diffeomorphisms*, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S., **51** (1980), 137-174.
[15] P. Kościelniak, *On genericity of shadowing and periodic shadowing property*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **310** (2005), 188–196.
[16] P. Kościelniak, *On the genericity of chaos*, Topology Appl., **154** (2007), 1951-1955.
[17] P. Kościelniak, M. Mazur, P. Oprocha and P. Pilarczyk, *Shadowing is generic-a continuous case*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., **34** (2014), 3591-3609.
[18] J. Li and P. Oprocha, *Shadowing property, weak mixing and regular recurrence*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations, **25** (2013), 1233–1249.
[19] J. Li and M. Wu, *Generic property of irregular sets in systems satisfying the specification property*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., **34** (2014), 635-645.
[20] P. Mattila, Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces, fractals and rectifiability (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
[21] L. Olsen, *Divergence points of deformed empirical measures*, Math. Res. Lett., **9** (2002), 1-13.

[22] L. Olsen, *Multifractal analysis of divergence points of deformed measure theoretical Birkhoff averages*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **82** (2003), 1591-1649.
[23] L. Olsen, S. Winter, *Normal and non-normal points of self-similar sets and divergence points of self-similar measures*. J. London Math. Soc., **67** (2003), 103-122.
[24] C. E. Pfister and W. G. Sullivan, *Large deviations estimates for dynamical systems without the specification property. Application to the β-shifts*, Nonlinearity, **18** (2005), 237-261.
[25] C. E. Pfister and W. G. Sullivan, *On the topological entropy of saturated sets*. Erg. Th. Dynam. Syst., **27** (2007), 929-956.
[26] K. Sigmund, On dynamical systems with the specification property. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 190 (1974), 285-299.
[27] T.K.S. Moothathu and P. Oprocha, *Shadowing, entropy and minimal subsystems*. Monatsh. Math., **172** (2013), 357–378.
[28] F. Takens and E. Verbitskiy, *On the variational principle for the topological entropy of certain non-compact sets*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, **23** (2003), no. 1, 317-348.
[29] D. J. Thompson, *Irregular sets, the β-transformation and the almost specification property*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **364** (2012), 5395-5414.
[30] P. Walters, *An introduction to ergodic theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
[31] K. Yano, *A remark on the topological entropy of homeomorphisms*, Invent. Math., **59** (1980), 215-220.

(Y. Dong) School of Mathematical Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, People's Republic of China
E-mail address: dongyiwei0@sina.com

(P. Oprocha) AGH University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Applied Mathematics, al. A. Mickiewicza 30, 30-059 Kraków, Poland, – and —, National Supercomputing Centre IT4Innovations, Division of the University of Ostrava, Institute for Research and Applications of Fuzzy Modeling, 30. dubna 22, 70103 Ostrava, Czech Republic
E-mail address: oprocha@agh.edu.pl

(X. Tian) School of Mathematical Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, People's Republic of China
E-mail address: xuetingtian@fudan.edu.cn